



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/858,350

05/15/2001

Won Ho Jhe

18079-300101

1776

25696

7590

02/27/2003

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY

P. O. BOX 10356

PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

LUU, THANH X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2878

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/858,350

Applicant(s)

JHE ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh X Luu

Art Unit

2878

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 13 January 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to amendments and remarks filed January 13, 2003. Claims 1-17 are currently pending.

#### ***Drawings***

1. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on January 13, 2003 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl (U.S. Patent 4,851,671).

Regarding claims 1, 3 and 8, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1 and claim 1) a high frequency dithering probe for a high speed scanning probe microscope, comprising: a high frequency quartz-crystal resonator (2) having a fundamental resonant frequency in the range of 1MHz – 100MHz (20 MHz; see column 2, lines 58-59) and a thickness of 0.01 mm – 2.0mm (0.1mm; see column 2, line 32); and having an electrode (5 or 6) attached to a surface of the quartz-crystal resonator; and a probe (1) attached to the quartz-crystal resonator. Pohl further discloses (see claim 1; "said tip (1) is directly

Art Unit: 2878

attached to one surface of an oscillating body (2)”) the probe (1) is attached on the surface of the quartz-crystal resonator (2). Pohl also discloses (see column 1, lines 64-66 and column 2, lines 15-25) the scanning probe microscope is a noncontact mode (“maintained at said working distance from said surface” and “brought sufficiently close”) atomic force microscope. Pohl does not specifically disclose the length of the probe. However, Pohl teaches (see column 2, lines 30-34) the length, height and width of the resonator (2) are all about 0.1mm. Thus, according to the scale of the figures, the probe is at most .2mm in length. Further, choosing particular length of the probe requires only routine skill in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a probe of not more than 2mm in the apparatus of Pohl to provide for more sensitive detection as desired.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Quate (U.S. Patent 5,354,985).

Regarding claim 4, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl does not specifically disclose the probe is a cantilever attached to the resonator. Quate teaches (see Figure 2) a resonator (35) in which a cantilever (10) probe is attached to. Thus, Quate recognizes that scanning probe microscopy could further be implemented with a cantilever probe. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a cantilever attached to the resonator of Pohl in view of Quate to further detection by providing near field scanning.

Art Unit: 2878

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent 3,872,411).

Regarding claim 2, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1 and column 2, line 33) the crystal resonator is formed in a flat square type shape with millimeter thickness. Pohl does not specifically disclose the resonator having a disk type shape or having the claimed area. Watanabe et al. teach (see Figures) a quartz crystal resonator formed in a flat disk type shape. Watanabe et al. further teach (see column 4, lines 15-25) that high resonant frequencies are dependent upon the diameter and thickness of the disk. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a disk shape resonator having the claimed area in the apparatus of Pohl to provide a desired resonant frequency.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Quake (U.S. Patent 6,002,471).

Regarding claim 7, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl does not specifically disclose the probe is a carbon nanotube. Quake teaches (see claim 11) an atomic force microscope having carbon nanotube probes. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a carbon nanotube probe in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Quake to improve detection by providing a very sharp and durable tip for finer scanning.

7. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Karrai (U.S. Patent 5,641,896).

Art Unit: 2878

Regarding claim 5, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl does not specifically disclose the probe as a sharpened optical fiber tip. Karrai teaches (see Figure 4) a sharpened optical fiber tip (10) attached to a quartz crystal resonator (5). Karrai further recognizes (see column 8, line 38-40) that such tips can be easily manufactured. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a sharpened optical fiber tip in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Karrai to reduce manufacturing costs.

Regarding claim 9, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl does not specifically disclose the probe is made of transparent material to transmit light. Karrai teaches (see Figure 3) a probe (not labeled) made of a transparent material (optical fiber) attached to a quartz crystal resonator (tuning fork) to transmit light. Thus, Karrai recognizes that another type of scanning can be performed with a transparent probe. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a probe made of transparent material in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Karrai to further detection by providing optical scanning tunneling microscopy.

8. Claims 6, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. (U.S. Patent 4,880,975).

Regarding claim 6, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl does not specifically disclose the probe is a tungsten tip. Nishioka et al. teach (see Figure 1 and column 7, lines 15-16) a tungsten tip (5) on a scanning tunneling microscope. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to provide a tungsten tip in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. to improve detection by providing a more resilient and durable tip.

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe is attached on a side of the crystal resonator. Pohl also discloses (see column 1, lines 64-66 and column 2, lines 15-25) the scanning probe microscope is a noncontact mode ("maintained at said working distance from said surface" and "brought sufficiently close") atomic force microscope. Pohl does not specifically disclose the probe attached in such a manner that the probe extends through a hole formed in the resonator. Nishioka et al. teaches (see Figure 1) a probe attached in such a manner that it extends through a hole (at 4a) formed in a resonator (2). Thus, Nishioka et al. recognize that a probe can be more securely attached through the resonator. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach the probe in such a manner that it extends through a hole of the resonator in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. to provide a more resilient and durable probe.

9. Claims 11, 13-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of Karrai.

Regarding claim 11, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl and Nishioka et al. do not specifically disclose the probe as an optical fiber tip. Karrai teaches (see Figure 4) an optical fiber tip (10) attached to a quartz crystal resonator (5). Karrai further recognizes (see column 8, line 38-40) that such tips can be easily manufactured. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2878

at the time the invention was made to use a sharpened optical fiber tip in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. and Karrai to reduce manufacturing costs.

Regarding claim 14, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) the probe (1) is a pointed tip. Pohl and Nishioka et al. do not specifically disclose the probe is made of transparent material to transmit light. Karrai teaches (see Figure 3) a probe (not labeled) made of a transparent material (optical fiber) attached to a quartz crystal resonator (tuning fork) to transmit light. Thus, Karrai recognizes that an additional type of scanning can be performed with a transparent probe. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a probe made of transparent material in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. and Karrai to improve detection by providing scanning tunneling-type microscopy.

Regarding claims 13 and 17, Pohl discloses (see column 1, line 8-10) the scanning probe microscope is used as an atomic force microscope. Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. do not specifically disclose the microscope as a near field scanning optical microscope. Karrai teaches (see column 1, lines 10-17) that the scanning probe microscope could be put into different uses, such as, near field microscopy or atomic force microscopy. Thus, Karrai recognizes that scanning probe microscopes could be easily adapted to different types of scans. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a near field optical microscope in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. and Karrai as to provide improved scanning through observations in the near field.



Regarding claim 15, Pohl discloses (see claim 1) the probe is directly attached to a surface of the resonator. Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. do not specifically disclose removing a portion of the electrode to attach the probe. However, choosing the particular manner in which the probe is attached is a matter of design choice and would require only routine skill in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to remove a portion of the electrode in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. and Karrai to more easily attach the probe directly to the surface of the resonator.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. and Karrai as applied to claims 1, 10 and 14, and further in view of Ohtaki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,276,324).

Regarding claim 16, Pohl discloses (see Figure 1) an electrode attached to a resonator. Pohl in view of Nishioka et al. and Karrai do not specifically disclose the electrode as being transparent. Ohtaki et al. teach (see column 3, lines 33-38) using transparent electrodes to reduce light loss in scanning tunneling microscopy. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an transparent electrode in the apparatus of Pohl in view of Nishioka et al., Karrai and Ohtaki et al. to reduce light loss in the scanning and improve detection.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed January 13, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2878

The Seo et al. reference has been withdrawn pursuant June H. Park and Jin B. Moon's disclaiming declaration.

Regarding claims 1, 3 and 8, Applicant asserts that the prior art does not disclose the probe having a length of not more than 2mm. However, the particular length of the probe is a matter of design choice and would require only routine skill in the art to choose. As set forth above, the length of the probe is obvious modification to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 4, Applicant asserts that a piezoelectric unit is not the same as a quartz crystal resonator. Piezoelectric units are known to comprise of quartz crystal resonators. Further, since the piezoelectric unit acts as a resonator in a high speed scanning probe, Examiner maintains that the invention remains obvious as set forth above.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant asserts that Watanabe et al. do not teach a probe attached to a disk type quartz crystal resonator. Examiner reminds Applicant that the claim was rejected over Pohl in view of Watanabe et al. Pohl discloses attaching a probe to a quartz crystal resonator. Watanabe et al. teach that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a disk type quartz crystal resonator as set forth above. Thus, Applicants assertions are not persuasive since Applicant interprets the reference Watanabe et al. in isolation.

Similarly regarding claims 6, 10 and 12, Applicant asserts that Nishioka et al. do not teach the probe extending through a hole of a high frequency quartz-crystal

Art Unit: 2878

resonator. Applicant ignores the teachings of Pohl of the high frequency quartz-crystal resonator. Thus, Examiner maintains the rejection as set forth above.

Regarding claim 15, Examiner has clarified the rejection as set forth above.

Regarding claim 16, Applicant's assertion ignores the references of Pohl, Nishioka et al. and Karrai that teaches of the quartz crystal resonator. Applicant has failed to address why it would not have been obvious to combine the references to obtain the claimed invention.

Thus, as set forth above, this rejection is proper.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2878

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh X. Luu whose telephone number is (703) 305-0539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta, can be reached on (703) 308-4852. The fax phone number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

txl  
February 26, 2003

  
Que T. Le  
Primary Examiner